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## Disease Version

### AC Shell

Advantage 1 is the World Trade Organization

The WTO is using its trade authority to challenge environmental protection and prioritize resource extraction.

**Global Exchange 11** writes[[1]](#footnote-1)

5. The WTO Is Destroying the Environment **The WTO is being used by corporations to dismantle** hard-won local and national **environmental protections, which are attacked as “barriers to trade.”** The very first WTO panel ruled that a provision of the US Clean Air Act, requiring both domestic and foreign producers alike to produce cleaner gasoline, was illegal. The WTO declared illegal a provision of the Endangered Species Act that requires shrimp sold in the US to be caught with an inexpensive device allowing endangered sea turtles to escape. **The WTO is attempting to deregulate industries including logging, fishing, water** utilities**, and energy distribution, which will lead to further exploitation of** these **natural resources.**

The PP challenges WTO authority over environmental issues. This is key to generating momentum to shut down the WTO.

**Mokhiber and Weissman 99** write[[2]](#footnote-2)

**The WTO eviscerates the Precautionary Principle**. **WTO rules** generally **block countries from acting in response to potential risk** -- requiring a probability before governments can move to resolve harms to human health or the environment. The WTO squashes diversity. WTO rules establish international health, environmental and other standards as a global ceiling through a process of "harmonization;" countries or even states and cities can only exceed them by overcoming high hurdles. The WTO operates in secrecy. Its tribunals rule on the "legality" of nations' laws, but carry out their work behind closed doors. **The WTO limits governments' ability to use their purchasing dollar for** human rights, **environmental**, worker rights and other non-commercial **purposes**. In general, **WTO rules state that governments can make purchases based only on quality and cost** considerations. The WTO disallows bans on imports of goods made with child labor. In general, WTO rules do not allow countries to treat products differently based on how they were produced -- irrespective of whether made with brutalized child labor, with workers exposed to toxics or with no regard for species protection. The WTO legitimizes life patents. WTO rules permit and in some cases require patents or similar exclusive protections for life forms. Some of these problems, such as the WTO's penchant for secrecy, could potentially be fixed, but the core problems -- **prioritization of commercial** over other **values**, the constraints on democratic decision-making **and** the **bias against local economies** -- cannot, for they **are inherent in the WTO itself. Because of these** unfixable **problems, the W**orld **T**rade **O**rganization **should be shut down**, sooner rather than later. That doesn't mean interim steps shouldn't be taken. It does mean that **beneficial reforms will** focus not on adding new areas of competence to the WTO or enhancing its authority, even if the new areas appear desirable (such as labor rights or competition). Instead, the reforms to pursue are those that reduce or **limit the WTO's power -- for example, by denying it** the **authority to invalidate laws passed pursuant to international environmental agreements**, limiting application of WTO agricultural rules in the Third World, or eliminating certain subject matters (such as essential medicines or life forms) from coverage under the WTO's intellectual property agreement. **These measures** are necessary and desirable in their own right, and they **would help generate momentum to close down the WTO.**

WTO trade agreements enable rich countries to manipulate developing countries.

**Walker 11** writes[[3]](#footnote-3)

But the WTO membership has failed to deliver the promised pro-development changes. Finding "development" in the Doha Development Round today is like looking for a needle in a haystack. **Developing countries have been completely sidelined** by the economic and political interests of global powers. Here are 10 examples of how the WTO has failed the poor: 1. Cotton: the Fairtrade Foundation revealed last year how the $47bn in subsidies paid to rich-country producers in the past 10 years has created barriers for the 15 million cotton farmers across west Africa trying to trade their way out of poverty, and how 5 million of the world's poorest farming families have been forced out of business and into deeper poverty because of those subsidies. 2. Agricultural subsidies: beyond cotton, WTO members have failed even to agree how to reduce the huge subsidies paid to rich world farmers, whose overproduction continues to threaten the livelihoods of developing world farmers. 3. Trade agreements: the **WTO** has also failed to clarify the deliberately ambiguous rules on concluding **trade agreements** that **allow the poorest countries to be manipulated by** the **rich states. In Africa, in negotiations with the EU, countries have been forced to eliminate tariffs on** up to **90% of their trade** because no clear rules exist to protect them. 4. Special treatment: the rules for developing countries, called "special and differential treatment" rules, were meant to be reviewed to make them more precise, effective and operational. But the WTO has failed to work through the 88 proposals that would fill the legal vacuum. 5. Medicine: the poorest in developing countries are unable to access affordable medicine because members have failed to clarify ambiguities between the need for governments to protect public health on one hand and on the other to protect the intellectual property rights of pharmaceutical companies. 6. Legal costs: the WTO pledged to improve access to its expensive and complex legal system, but has failed. In 15 years of dispute settlement under the WTO, 400 cases have been initiated. No African country has acted as a complainant and only one least developed country has ever filed a claim. 7. Protectionist economic policies: one of the WTO's five core functions agreed at its inception in 1995 was to achieve more coherence in global economic policy-making. Yet the WTO failed to curb the speedy increase in the number of protectionist measures applied by G20 countries in response to the global economic crisis over the past two years – despite G20 leaders' repeated affirmations of their "unwavering" commitment to resist all forms of protectionist measures. 8. Natural disaster: the WTO fails to alleviate suffering when it has the opportunity to do so. In the case of natural disaster, the membership will have taken almost two years to agree and implement temporary trade concessions for Pakistan, where severe flooding displaced 20 million people in 2010 and caused $10bn of damage. Those measures, according to the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development, would have boosted Pakistan's exports to the EU by at least €100m this year. 9. Decision-making: **the WTO makes most** of its **decisions by consensus** – and achieving consensus between 153 countries is nearly impossible. **But** this shows another failure of the WTO: to break the link between market size and political weight that would give small and poor countries a voice in the trade negotiations. 10. Fair trade: 10 years after the start of the Doha Development Round, governments have failed to make trade fair. As long as **small and poor countries remain without a voice**, the role of campaigning organisations, such as Traidcraft and Fairtrade Foundation, which are working together to eliminate cotton subsidies, will remain critical. The WTO has failed to live up to its promises over the past decade, which reveals a wider systemic problem in the global community. True and lasting solutions to global economic problems can only come when the model of global competitiveness between countries becomes one of genuine cooperation.

WTO manipulation of developing countries causes disease, hunger, and income inequality.

**Global Exchange 11** writes[[4]](#footnote-4)

6. The WTO is Killing People The WTO’s fierce defense of ‘Trade Related Intellectual Property’ rights (TRIPs)—patents, copyrights and trademarks—comes at the expense of health and human lives. **The WTO has protected** for **pharmaceutical companies’ ‘right to profit’ against governments** seeking to protect their people’s health by **providing lifesaving medicines in** countries in areas like sub-saharan **Africa, where thousands die** every day **from** HIV/**AIDS**. Developing countries won an important victory in 2001 when they affirmed the right to produce generic drugs (or import them if they lacked production capacity), so that they could provide essential lifesaving medicines to their populations less expensively. Unfortunately, in September 2003, many new conditions were agreed to that will make it more difficult for countries to produce those drugs. Once again, the WTO demonstrates that it favors corporate profit over saving human lives. 7. **The WTO is Increasing Inequality** Free trade is not working for the majority of the world. During the most recent period of rapid growth in global trade and investment (1960 to 1998) inequality worsened both internationally and within countries. The UN Development Program reports that the richest 20 percent of the world’s population consume 86 percent of the world’s resources while the poorest 80 percent consume just 14 percent. WTO rules have hastened these trends **by opening up countries to foreign investment and thereby making it easier** for production **to go where the labor is cheapest** and most easily exploited and environmental costs are low. 8. The WTO is Increasing Hunger Farmers produce enough food in the world to feed everyone – yet because of corporate control of food distribution, as many as 800 million people worldwide suffer from chronic malnutrition. According to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, food is a human right. **In developing countries,** as many as **four out of** every **five** people **make their living from the land. But** the leading principle in the WTO’s Agreement on Agriculture is that market forces should control agricultural policies-rather than a national commitment to guarantee food security and maintain decent family farmer incomes. **WTO policies have allowed** dumping of **heavily subsidized industrial**ly produced **food into poor countries, undermining local production and increasing hunger.** 9. The WTO Hurts Poor, Small Countries in Favor of Rich Powerful Nations The WTO supposedly operates on a consensus basis, with equal decision-making power for all. In reality, many important decisions get made in a process whereby poor countries’ negotiators are not even invited to closed door meetings – and then ‘agreements’ are announced that poor countries didn’t even know were being discussed. Many countries do not even have enough trade personnel to participate in all the negotiations or to even have a permanent representative at the WTO. This severely disadvantages poor countries from representing their interests. Likewise, **many countries are too poor to defend themselves** from WTO challenges **from the rich countries**, and change their laws rather than pay for their own defense. 10. The WTO Undermines Local Level Decision-Making and National Sovereignty The WTO’s “most favored nation” provision requires all WTO member countries to treat each other equally and to treat all corporations from these countries equally regardless of their track record. Local policies aimed at rewarding companies who hire local residents, use domestic materials, or adopt environmentally sound practices are essentially illegal under the WTO. **Developing countries are prohibited from creating local laws** that developed countries once pursued, such as **protecting** new, **domestic industries until they can be internationally competitive**. California Governor Gray Davis vetoed a “Buy California” bill that would have granted a small preference to local businesses because it was WTO-illegal. Conforming with the WTO required entire sections of US laws to be rewritten. Many countries are even changing their laws and constitutions in anticipation of potential future WTO rulings and negotiations. 11. There are Alternatives to the WTO Citizen organizations have developed alternatives to the corporate-dominated system of international economic governance. Together we can build the political space that nurtures a democratic global economy that promotes jobs, ensures that every person is guaranteed their human rights to food, water, education, and health care, promotes freedom and security, and preserves our shared environment for future generations. 12. The Tide is Turning Against Free Trade and the WTO! **International opposition to the WTO is growing**. Massive protests in Seattle of 1999 brought over 50,000 people together to oppose the WTO—and succeeded in shutting the meeting down. When the WTO met in 2001, the Trade negotiators were unable meet their goals of expanding the WTO’s reach. **In** Cancún, **Mexico and** Hong Kong, **China, the WTO met** thousands of **activists in protest**, scoring a major victory for democracy. **Developing countries refused to give in to** the rich countries’ agenda of **WTO expansion - and caused the talks to collapse!**

Pandemic disease is likely and causes extinction. Free trade uniquely triggers the impact.

**Keating 9**[[5]](#footnote-5)

How it could happen: **Throughout history, plagues have brought civilizations to their knees. The Black Death killed** more off more than **half of Europe**'s population in the Middle Ages. **In 1918,** a **flu** pandemic **killed** an estimated 50 million people, nearly **3 percent of the world**'s **population**, a far **greater** impact **than** the just-concluded **World War I. Because of globalization, diseases today spread even faster** - witness the rapid worldwide spread of H1N1 currently unfolding. A **global outbreak of** a **disease** **such as ebola** virus -- **which has** had a **90 percent fatality** rate during its flare-ups in rural Africa -- **or a** mutated **drug-resistant** form of the **flu** virus on a global scale **could have a** devastating, even **civilization-ending impact.** How likely is it? Treatment of deadly diseases has improved since 1918, but so have the diseases. Modern industrial farming techniques have been blamed for the outbreak of diseases, such as swine flu, and **as** the world’s population grows and **humans move into** previously **unoccupied areas, the risk of** exposure to previously **unknown pathogens increases. More than 40 new viruses** have **emerged since the** 19**70s**, including ebola and HIV. **Bio**logical **weapons** experimentation has **add**ed **a new** and just as troubling **complication.**

### 1AR Impact Frontline

No burnout.

**Torrey and Yolken 5** write[[6]](#footnote-6)

The outcome of this marriage, however, is not as clearly defined as it was once thought to be. **For** many **years, it was believed that microbes** and human **slowly** learn to live with each other as microbes **evolve toward** a benign **coexistence** wit their hosts. Thus, the bacterium that causes syphilis was thought to be extremely virulent when it initially spread among humans in the sixteenth century, then to have slowly become less virulent over the following three centuries. This reassuring view of microbial history has recently been challenged by Paul Ewald and others, who have questioned whether microbes do necessarily evolve toward long-term accommodation with their hosts. Under certain circumstances, Ewald argues, “**Natural selection may…favor** the **evolution of extreme harmfulness** if the exploitation that damages the host [i.e. disease] enhances the ability of the harmful variant to compete with a more benign pathogen.” **The outcome** of such a “marriage” **may** thus **be the murder of one spouse by the other**. In eschatological terms, this view argues that **a microbe** such as HIV or SARS virus **may be** truly **capable of eradicating the human race**.

Pandemics outweigh nukes on probability and magnitude.

**Zakaria 5** writes[[7]](#footnote-7)

A flu pandemic is the most dangerous threat the United States faces today," says Richard Falkenrath, who until recently served in the Bush administration as deputy Homeland Security adviser. "It's a bigger threat than terrorism. In fact it's bigger than anything I dealt with when I was in government." One makes a threat assessment **on** the basis of two factors: the **probability** of the event, **and** the **loss of life** if it happened. On both counts, **a pandemic ranks higher than** a major **terror** attack, even one **involving w**eapons of **m**ass **d**estruction. **A crude nuclear device would probably kill hundreds of thousands**. A flu **pandemic could easily kill millions. Whether this** particular **virus makes the** final, **fatal mutation that allows it to move from human to human, one day some virus will**. The basic factor that is fueling this surge of viruses is China's growth. (China is the natural habitat of the influenza virus.) As China develops, it urbanizes, and its forests and wetlands shrink. That forces migratory birds to gather closer together-and closer to human habitation--which increases the chances of a virus spreading from one species to the next. Also, growth means a huge rise in chicken consumption. Across thousands of homes in China every day, chickens are slaughtered in highly unhygienic ways. "Every day the chances that this virus or another such virus will move from one species to another grow," says Laurie Garrett, author of "The Coming Plague," who has been writing brilliantly on this topic for years. Nobody really disputes that we are badly unprepared for this threat. "If something like this pandemic were to happen today," says Falkenrath, "the government would be mostly an observer, not a manager." The government can't even give intelligent advice to its citizens because it doesn't actually know what to say. We don't know whether people should stay put, leave cities, stay home or go to the nearest hospital. **During the cold war**, hundreds of people in government participated in dozens of **crisis simulations of nuclear wars**, accidents and incidents. These "tabletop exercises" **were conducted so** that if and when a real crisis hit, **policymakers would not be confronting critical decisions for the first time. No such expertise exists for today's deadliest threat.**

## Water Wars Version

### AC Shell

The WTO uses its trade authority to push for water privatization. This risks water wars and causes shortages which already kill millions in Africa.

**Holland 5** writes[[8]](#footnote-8)

Water is viewed as one of the last "profit centers" by the international financial institutions and trade can impact whether it becomes a commodity or stays in public hands -- **90 percent of the world's water** supplies **remain in the public trust**. Most notably water's on the table with the privatization of municipal water systems being aggressively pushed under the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), a wide-ranging treaty that covers a host of services, both public and private. Vandana Shiva, the scientist and global justice activist, argued this week that "we need to recognize that **90 percent of humanity lives on water as commons** today." She lambasted a recent World Bank report urging poor countries to privatize their water systems, saying, "It actually talks about one major threat to water markets being community rights to water, and says these must be dismantled. As if there's something wrong with the commons, as if it's a primitive stage of human existence." According to the United Nations, 1.3 billion people in the world lack access to clean water and worldwide demand is doubling every 20 years -- twice the rate of population growth. **By** the year **2025, demand for** fresh **water is expected to outstrip global supply by 56 percent**. The issue gets scant attention, but analysts say that while the advanced nations are likely to wean themselves of their addiction to oil, **water is the finite resource that will drive this century's wars** just as fossil fuels did the last century's. Maude Barlowe is the Director of the Council of Canadians, an NGO deep in the fight. She told me the **water privatizers** are driven not only by profit, but also by a deeper ideology. "There are those of us who believe that water is a public good and should be protected in legislation at all levels as something that must be kept out of the market system. And there are those who've gone to the other side, and that would **include** the World Bank, the regional development banks, the International Monetary Fund, **the WTO and most** of the **big first world countries**. And they say that the only way to avoid the global shortage of water that's already here for some places but coming for the whole world is to privatize water, commodify it, put it on the open market for sale to the highest bidder and have it guided by the same rules that govern the trade in running shoes." Pushing the agenda here in Hong Kong are a small number of multinationals that dominate the growing water market. Two French titans, Vivendi Universal and Suez, dominate the group. According to a report by the Canadian NGO Polaris Institute in conjunction with Barlowe's Council of Canadians, the two -- often called the General Motors and Ford of the global water industry -- control over 70 percent of the existing world market in water services. RWE, a German electricity and waste management company, may soon challenge their market share. After purchasing two key water companies, RWE has positioned itself to expand. The U.S. construction giant Bechtel, now notorious for its no-bid reconstruction contracts in Iraq, is also a growing player. **Under the GATS treaty** being **pushed in Hong Kong, any government in the WTO** would be required to give foreign investors like these mammoth water corporations equal treatment with domestic investors like local government-owned utilities. Governments **would have to prove that** any **legislation** or regulation **related to public water** service **is** "necessary" and **"the least trade restrictive** of all possible measures**."** According to the NGOs, "in effect, **government regulations requiring high water quality** standards for safety, accessible rates for poor communities, or specific improvements in pipe infrastructure **could be declared "unnecessary"** by a WTO tribunal." **Through the WTO's "coherence agreement" with the World Bank and I**nternational **M**onetary **F**und**,** the **water behemoths get** an additional wedge: they're able to secure **loans** and grants **to finance** much of their **operations in the developing world**. These **institutions use water privatization as a "conditionality" for development aid**. A 2000 review of IMF loans in 40 countries found that 12 had loan conditions requiring some form of water privatization. The NGOs point out that "in general, it is African countries -- the smallest, poorest, and most debt ridden countries -- that experience these conditions. Tragically, **more than five million** people **die each year in Africa from poor water access**." The big water corporations are active supporters of networks of water policy think tanks and "lobby groups that prime the pump for privatization." The network includes the Global Water Partnership, the World Water Council and the World Commission on Water. All three have working relationships with international finance institutions, the major corporate players in the water industry and the governments of the big service economies.

Water shortages cause extinction from multiple violent conflicts. Corporate control uniquely triggers the impact.

**Barlow 8** writes[[9]](#footnote-9)

The three **water crises – dwindling** freshwater **supplies, inequitable access** to water **and** the **corporate control of water – pose the greatest threat** of our time to the planet and **to our survival**. Together with impending climate change from fossil fuel emissions, the water crises impose some life-or-death decisions on us all. **Unless we** collectively **change our behavior, we are heading toward** a world of deepening conflict and potential **wars** over the dwindling supplies of freshwater – between nations, between rich and poor, between the public and the private interest, between rural and urban populations, and between the competing needs of the natural world and industrialized humans. Water Is Becoming a Growing Source of Conflict Between Countries Around the world, more that 215 major rivers and 300 groundwater basins and aquifers are shared by two or more countries, creating tensions over ownership and use of the precious waters they contain. Growing **shortages** and unequal distribution of water **are causing disagreements**, sometimes violent, and becoming a security risk in many regions. Britain’s former defense secretary, John Reid, warns of coming “water wars.” In a public statement on the eve of a 2006 summit on climate change, Reid predicted that violence and political conflict would become more likely as watersheds turn to deserts, glaciers melt and water supplies are poisoned. He went so far as to say that the global water crisis was becoming a global security issue and that Britain’s armed forces should be prepared to tackle conflicts, including warfare, over dwindling water sources. “Such **changes make** the emergence of **violent conflict more**, rather than less, **likely**,” former British prime minister Tony Blair told The Independent. “The blunt truth is that the lack of water and agricultural land is a significant contributory factor to the tragic conflict we see unfolding in Darfur. We should see this as a warning sign.” The Independent gave several other examples of regions of **potential conflict**. These include **Israel, Jordan and Palestine**, who all rely on the Jordan River, which is controlled by Israel; **Turkey and** **Syria**, where Turkish plans to build dams on the Euphrates River brought the country to the brink of war with Syria in 1998, and where Syria now accuses Turkey of deliberately meddling with its water supply; **China and India**, where the Brahmaputra River has caused tension between the two countries in the past, and where China’s proposal to divert the river is re-igniting the divisions; **Angola, Botswana** and Namibia, where disputes over the Okavango water basin that have flared in the past are now threatening to re-ignite as Namibia is proposing to build a threehundred- kilometer pipeline that will drain the delta; **Ethiopia and Egypt**, where population growth is threatening conflict along the Nile; and **Bangladesh and India,** where flooding in the Ganges caused by melting glaciers in the Himalayas is wreaking havoc in Bangladesh, leading to a rise in illegal, and unpopular, migration to India.

### 1AR Impact Frontline

Best studies confirm – water scarcity causes conflict

**Montenegro 9** writes[[10]](#footnote-10)

It’s often been said that the next resource wars will be fought not over oil but over water. In 2007 **an 18-month study** of Sudan **by the UN** Environment Program **concluded** that the conflict in **Darfur had its roots in** climate change and **water shortage**s. According to the report, disappearing pasture and **evaporating water holes**—rainfall is down 30 percent over 40 years in some parts of the Sahel—had sparked dispute between herders and farmers and **threatened to trigger** a succession of new **wars across Africa.** Months later, **the British nonprofit** International Alert **released a study identifying 46 countries**—home to 2.7 billion people—**where water** and climate stresses **could ignite** violent **conflict by 2025, prompting UN Secretary-General** Ban Ki-moon **to say**, “The consequences for humanity are grave. **Water scarcity** threatens economic and social gains and **is a potent fuel for war**s and conflict.” Those remarks came just as David Zhang of Hong Kong University published a study linking water shortages to violence throughout history. **Analyzing** half a millennium’s worth of human conflict—more than **8,000 wars**—**Zhang concluded** that climate change and resulting **water shortages had been a far greater trigger than previously imagined**. “We are on alert, because this gives us the indication that resource shortage is the main cause of war,” Zhang told the London Times. Now, in **UNESCO’s** third major World Water Development **Report**, released in March at the World Water Forum in Istanbul, the threat is again plainly **stated: “As** climate change and **adverse water impacts** increase in **politically charged areas, conflicts will** likely **intensify**, requiring new and rapid adaptive security strategies.”

Water wars go global. Water is a resource that any country will try to maintain.

**Postel and Wolf 1**[[11]](#footnote-11)

Others argue, however, that when it comes to water the past will not be a reliable guide to the future. A renewable but not infinite resource, **fresh water is becoming** increasingly **scarce**: The amount available to the world today is almost the same as it was when the Mesopotamians traded blows, even as global demand has steadily increased. Just since 1950, the renewable supply per person has fallen 58 percent as world population has swelled from 2.5 billion to 6 billion. Moreover, **unlike oil and** most **other strategic resources, fresh water has no substitute** in most of its uses. It is essential for growing food, manufacturing goods, and safeguarding human health. And while history suggests that **cooperation over water** has been the norm, it **has not been the rule. One fourth of water-related interactions during the last half century were hostile**. Although the vast majority of these hostilities involved no more than verbal antagonism, rival countries went beyond name-calling on 37 recorded occasions and fired shots, blew up a dam, or undertook some other form of military action. Lost amidst this perennial debate over whether there will be water wars has been a serious effort to understand precisely how and why tensions develop, beyond the simplistic cause-and-effect equation that water shortages lead to wars. First, whether or not **water scarcity** causes outright warfare between nations in the years ahead, it already **causes enough violence and conflict** within nations **to** threaten social and political stability. And as recent events in the Balkans and sub-Saharan Africa demonstrated, today's civil conflicts have a nasty habit of **spill**ing **over borders and becoming** tomorrow's **international wars**. Second, water disputes between countries, though typically not leading to war directly, have fueled decades of regional tensions, thwarted economic development, and risked provoking larger conflicts before eventually giving way to cooperation. The obsession with water wars begs more important questions: What are the early signs and likely locations of water-related disputes, and what can governments and international agents do to prevent the eruption of violence and political instability?

## Human Rights Version

### AC Impacts

WTO rules interfere with human rights protections. **Global Exchange 11** writes[[12]](#footnote-12)

3. The WTO Tramples Labor and Human Rights **WTO rules put** the “rights” of **corporations** to profit **over human** and labor **rights. The WTO encourages a ‘race to the bottom’** in wages **by pitting workers against each other rather than promoting internationally recognized labor standards. The WTO has ruled** that **it** is **illegal** for a government **to ban a product** based on the way it is **produced**, such as **with child labor. It has also ruled that governments cannot take into account** “non commercial values” such as human rights, or **the behavior of companies that do business with** vicious **dictatorships** such as Burma **when making purchasing decisions.**

Human rights norms solve global WMD conflict.

**Burke-White 4** writes[[13]](#footnote-13)

This Article presents a strategic--as opposed to ideological or normative--argument that the promotion of human rights should be given a more prominent place in U.S. foreign policy. It does so by suggesting a correlation between the domestic human rights practices of states and their propensity to engage in aggressive international conduct. Among the chief threats to U.S. national security are acts of aggression by other states. Aggressive acts of war may directly endanger the United States, as did the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941, or they may require U.S. military action overseas, as in Kuwait fifty years later. **Evidence** from the post-Cold War period  [\*250]  **indicates** that **states that** systematically **abuse** their own citizens' **human rights are** also those **most likely to engage in aggression**. To the degree that **improvements in** various states' human **rights** records **decrease** the **likelihood of** aggressive **war**, a foreign **policy informed by** human **rights can significantly enhance** U.S. and **global security**. Since 1990, a state's domestic human rights policy appears to be a telling indicator of that state's propensity to engage in international aggression. A central element of U.S. foreign policy has long been the preservation of peace and the prevention of such acts of aggression. [2](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=62d5bddd50e555db7dfb40b14668cef6&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzW-zSkAW&_md5=a81b07a0a90d95be59f9b7bb9d939181#n2) If the correlation discussed herein is accurate, it provides U.S. policymakers with a powerful new tool to enhance national security through the promotion of human rights. A strategic linkage between national security and human rights would result in a number of important policy modifications. First, it changes the prioritization of those countries U.S. policymakers have identified as presenting the greatest concern. Second, it alters some of the policy prescriptions for such states. Third, it offers states a means of signaling benign international intent through the improvement of their domestic human rights records. Fourth, it provides a way for a current government to prevent future governments from aggressive international behavior through the institutionalization of human rights protections. Fifth, **it addresses the** particular **threat of** human rights abusing **states obtaining** weapons of mass destruction (**WMD**). Finally, it offers a mechanism for U.S.-U.N. cooperation on human rights issues.

### Extra Impact Cards

Human rights violations spill over and cause global wars.

**Trachtman 12** writes[[14]](#footnote-14)

It is true that human rights violations may cause significant international external effects, including refugee crises, ethnic or other conflict, certain types of regulatory competition as in connection with labor rights, and more diluted external effects in terms of reduced economic growth. Human rights violations may also certainly cause external effects through altruism: **citizens** of foreign states **may suffer diminished utility by knowing of** **human rights violations in other states.** This is certainly a large motivation for international human rights law: people care about the human rights circumstances in other states. A. Physical Externalities First, human rights violations may simply cause victims or those at risk to leave the perpetrating state. If this **emigration** is disorderly, excessively large, or politically unappealing in other ways, it **may cause direct adverse effects outside the perpetrating state.** The **human rights violations may create conditions that would result in civil war or a threat to international peace** and security. Other states may wish to avoid a situation in which they would be compelled to intervene at great cost. Security Council actions with respect to Libya,5 Somalia,6 Haiti, 7 Rwanda8 and Kosovo9 may be understood in this way. The recently formulated “responsibility to protect”10 may be understood as a proposal to address these types of external effects, as well as a proposal to give affected states some power to respond. It states that “[e]ach individual State has the responsibility to protect its populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.” The international community may use diplomatic, humanitarian, and other peaceful means, and if those fail, may take “collec tive action, in a timely and decisive manner, through the Security Council, in accordance with the Charter, including Chapter VII, on a case-by-case basis” when “national authorities are manifestly failing to protect their populations” from these crimes.11 Another type of direct externality would involve mistreatment of foreigners. A state may appropriate property of foreigners, or otherwise abuse foreigners in a way that causes a direct external effect. Of course, this type of externality might be addressed simply by providing “better-than-national-treatment” to the foreign persons. Internalization of these externalities would thus not necessarily require that broad human rights be accorded to residents. B. Demonstration Effects Another type of externality is ideational. That is, **if one state abuses its citizens it may make it easier for another state** to do so. International public opinion might not be so outraged, or its **outrage might be diluted**, **by virtue of widespread violations**. Concerns about responses to the 9/11 attack by the United States that reduce human rights protections might be understood in this way.12 Thus fear of contagion—emulation by other states—would be one reason why citizens of one state would be concerned about human rights practices in another state. Conversely, **it might be hoped that by spreading human rights protection more broadly, it would be more difficult for one’s government to engage in human rights abuses**. This perspective supports Simmons’s argument that the reason why states adhere to human rights treaties is because they agree with the principles, but suggests why they agree with the principles for others, and support a treaty, as opposed to simply practicing human rights unilaterally. It is supported, to some extent, by Simmons’s empirical finding that ratification by a particular country is often associated with ratification by other countries within that country’s region.13

Human rights outweigh the environment. **IJsslmuiden 2k** writes[[15]](#footnote-15)

Finally, **the** implicit **definition of environmental health used by Smith** is in itself an expression of the dominance of the views of industrialized countries. Smith’s environmental health **seems** to be **physical, chemical, and biological**. Even famine and war fall outside this definition. The narrowness of this definition probably has two origins: the undeniable utility it has for scientific and technological development, and the fact that most environmental **scientists** in the developed world **have forgotten that** health in general, and **environmental health** in particular, **requires** as a minimum a democracy and a viable culture of **human rights**. The history of **environmental health in the West had as much to do with science as** it had with **civic emancipation. In Africa**, where democracies can be counted on the fingers of one hand, where corruption is rife, and **where** the concept of **human rights hardly exist**s in practice**, neither ‘‘health for all’’ nor ‘‘environmental health for all’’ can be achieved**. Health workers in developing countries do not have the luxury of focusing exclusively on science and technology, but have to meet basic needs. While Smith argues that legal, administrative and management skills are needed to solve this problem, I argue that those skills are needed but they will not be effectively used without a more fundamental approach. Either individually as scientists and activists, or collectively with support from organizations outside the immediate sphere of health, the requirements of immediate survival and human rights must be met. Perhaps the most important shortcoming caused by the global dominance of industrialized-country views in environmental health is the narrowness of these views.

# Link

## No Reconciliation

The PP conflicts with WTO trade agreements. Full reconciliation is impossible.

**Borjeson 7** writes[[16]](#footnote-16)

**The P**recautionary **P**rinciple **is one of the most important** and well-known **environmental policies governing trade**, both nationally and internationally. The scope of this study will however be limited to the definition presented in Sandin 1999, where the author has identified four common elements of the principle from a number of definitions: “if there is a threat, which is uncertain, then some kind of action is mandatory” (Sandin 1999 quoted in Sandin et al 2002: 290). Or in other words: “on some occasions, measures against a possible hazard Principlerelated variables Outcome of GMO-dispute Process of GMO-dispute Politicallyand economically related variables Case-related variables Aims and actions of the WTO Aims and actions based on the Precautionary Principle 15 should be taken even if the available evidence is not enough to conclude the existence of the hazard as a scientific fact” (Sandin et al 2002: 288). Note however that an evaluation of the Precautionary Principle will not be done as such, seeing as the case-study is too limited in scope for this purpose and will therefore mainly be descriptive. The principle will be explored more thoroughly in section 4.5 Key Provisions of the Precautionary Principle. The WTO agreements on trade include a number of multilateral agreements aimed at liberalizing international trade and certainly not all of them are referred to within this study. More precisely, the principle governing the de-regulated trade is one of the principles stated in the preamble of the agreements establishing the world trade organization. Namely: “entering into reciprocal and mutually advantageous arrangements directed to the substantial reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade and to the elimination of discriminatory treatment in international trade relations (…), to develop an integrated, more viable and durable multilateral trading system”. In relation to the Precautionary Principle, the **WTO agreements state that** the right to take **precaution**ary measures **is only approved if** they are **not applied in a manner which would** result in “arbitrary or unjustifiable discrimination between countries, or a disguised **restrict**ion on international **trade**” (www.wto.org). Hence when the term WTO agreements on trade is used these are “the principles” being referred to. A more detailed exposition of the agreements will be given in the section 4.3 Key provisions on the WTO agreements on trade. Since this study concerns one case, this together with the purposive limitation of material makes the results less useful when generalizing and applying the findings of this study to a larger context and since this is a qualitative study the findings could be subject to other interpretations (Creswell 1994: 111). However, it makes a contribution to the ongoing debate on the concerned matter as the case-study has a high representativity when discussing the matter of subject. Although Rational Choice theory is used to explain causality, a complete causal approach will not be used. Since the study only handles one case and only one set of variables (the principle-related) a qualitative evaluation of the influence on the outcome by the independent variables concerned: the Precautionary Principle and the WTO agreements on trade will be done instead. Moreover, since the study is limited to one case it will not be possible to test the regularity of the variables. What it can however, is to study the presumable correlation in a case where the two conflicting principles are involved. The second phrase in research question nr 2: How were the two principles balanced in the outcome and why, might however be too difficult to fully answer with this limited approach. 16 Practical limitations An important methodological aspect of any scientific study concerns its validity and if the chosen indicators correspond to the chosen theoretical concepts (Yin 2003: 34). A validity fault could follow the purposive limitation of the factors being studied; in the concerned case this could be the result of focus being on the principle-related variables and not on all of the factors influencing the process and outcome. This limitation might result in the study not covering the conflict in its whole and leads to the question: will the study measure what it intends to measure, even when being limited to the chosen variables? The occurring regularity of the two principles in the process of the dispute together with legislative measures being based upon them indicates validity throughout the study. Moreover, the long process surrounding the conflict implies that this study focuses on a central and relevant issue. Another methodological aspect concerns the reliability of the study and the handling of the material used (Yin 2003: 38). One way to get around this uncertainty is by external reliability verification: to have another person read the material used and then to compare the results to see if these concur. This has however not been done in this study and consequently there is really no way getting around this problem. What has been done however, is internal reliability verification where the material has been read several times in order to be as sure as possible of what was actually said and concluded. A practical limitation of this study is time. Another is cost. The limited time-frame has put restrictions both on the research objective and the material used; interviews could for example have been a fruitful complement to the documents. Another practical limitation concerns the documents used. The case-study does not provide an examination of the submissions made by all complaining parties. This clearly puts limitations to both the study and its findings, but it has nonetheless been necessary to put a limit to the sources used. The documents used in the case-study are 1) the First Written Submission by the United States, 2) the First Written Submission by the European Communities and 3) the final Reports of the Dispute Settlement Panel. The reason for only looking at the US Submission and not the submissions of all the complaining parties in more detail is, again, the limited timeframe. Nevertheless, the material chosen is enough to illustrate the principle-related conflict. Finally, the issue being covered is in many ways a legal issue. I am however not a legal expert and the study will not be conducted within the realm of science of international law. Last there is the issue of my own personal bias and limits as a researcher, as has so clearly been pointed out: “the ethnographer enters the field with an open mind, not an empty head” 17 (Fetterman 1989 as quoted in Creswell 1994: 44). I might overlook certain issues and be limited in my knowledge of others. Hopefully those weaknesses will be overcome by the study being exposed to peer-review along with help from my supervisor. 2.4 Earlier research This study will be done in the context of environmental social science. It has been acknowledged that social sciences play an important part in environmental science and that it is of importance that they participate and are incorporated in research on sustainable development (www.formas.se). Sustainable development is however a very broad focus area and there really is no point in giving a thorough exposition on all of the previous research concerning it. So, the research focused on in this section mainly concerns the conflict between the trade related and environmentally protecting regimes and the incompatibility between them and the principles concerned. Furthermore, it touches the subject of how the Precautionary Principle stands in conflict with matters of trade. The earlier research consists of relevant articles on the matter, mostly articles within the realm of law and international agreements. The media of articles are chosen since they often are the bearers of the most recent information and new findings on a certain subject matter within a research area. They are also the easiest to find and duplicate (Creswell 1994: 28). There is no lack of writings on the conflict between environmental international regimes and agreements concerned with the matter of trade and the topic is clearly being discussed on the international arena (Schoenbaum 2000: 866). The **two regimes** principally **regulating** the international **trade with g**enetically **m**odified **o**rganism**s are the Cartagena Protocol** on Biosafety **and** the **W**orld **T**rade **O**rganization **Agreements** on trade. Previous studies have begun mapping where the regimes are in in-coherence with each other and the reasons to why one prevails over the other when faced in matters of dispute. When addressing the potential conflict between the two principles: **the P**recautionary **P**rinciple **and** the **WTO agreements** on trade, it has been found that also these two **contradict**. It has been proposed that while under the current WTO agreements and with the current definitions of the Precautionary Principle, **no full reconciliation** of the Precautionary Principle and trade liberalisation **is possible** (Matthee and Vermersch 2000: 69). Earlier studies have also concluded that one of the key issues in this debate is the extent to which the Precautionary Principle should be applied. It has been shown that **the Biosafety Protocol and** agreements under the umbrella of the **WTO agreements** on trade **contradict** each other on this 18 point **and** that **this will lead to future conflicts** (Schoenbaum 2000: 866). Trade- and environmental agreements aspire to be mutually supportive, but achieving this requires substantial harmonisation between the two. It has been found that each of the agreements treats the Precautionary Principle differently and the idea has been presented that there is a great risk that parties in trade disputes in GMOs will use either agreement depending on each party’s status in each agreement (http://ideas.repec.org). The area of research is only in its beginning and we are still to discover what the outcome of the GMO-case is going to have in practice. As stated earlier in the text, the outcome on the matter by the WTO Dispute Panel might very well come to have far reaching implications for the global governance of GMOs, possibilities for environmental protection and for international trade relations. To conclude: it has been found that there is an incoherence between the regimes governing environmental protection and international trade and that this incoherence applies to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety and the WTO agreements on trade. The two internationally recognized principals: the Precautionary Principle and the WTO agreements are found to be in conflict and it has been proposed that no reconciliation between them in their current form is possible. It is further emphasized that there is a need to address this issue because the contradiction on how to use the Precautionary Principle will lead to further conflicts and **this will undoubtedly result in obstacles** on the road **to sustainable development**. Here is where the importance of this study comes into the picture. If we are to achieve a sustainable development within the realm of trade there is a need to continue the research on the incoherence between the regimes and concerned principles and what implications this incoherence might have. Furthermore, there is a need to discuss this conflict and what difficulties the outcome of the conflict imposes on the handling of environmental problems through policy making. There is also a need to further observe how the disagreement on how the Precautionary Principle should be applied displays in actual conflicts, as in the case presented within this study, the GMO related trade conflict between the EC and the US, Canada and Argentina. To further point on the significance of this study and its relevance, it has in recent strategies for Swedish socio-environmental research been stated that the research objectives concerning division of power and goal conflicts are of high importance for socioenvironmental research. **Questions like who has** the **actual power in environmental politics** and how are goal conflicts displayed and manifested on national and international level **are** seen as at **the core** of the **issue** (www.formas.se) and these questions will to some extent be discussed within this study.

## Free Trade I/L

The WTO seeks to promote free trade.

**FOE 3** writes[[17]](#footnote-17)

The last Uruguay Round of negotiations led to the formation of the WTO. Whereas the GATT was an agreement with 'contracting parties' and served as a negotiating forum, **the WTO is** a recognised international body with 'members', which is **responsible for monitoring and enforcing the** World Trade Agreement (**WTA**) **which sets out the legal basis for trade policy**. The Uruguay Round was the longest, most tortuous and most controversial set of negotiations in the GATT's history. The Uruguay Round was concluded in 1994 and the WTO formed in 1995. By 2001, the WTO's membership stood at 142. **The WTO is responsible for administering** these **agreements and, according to the WTO Secretariat, it has three main objectives; "...to help trade flow as freely as possible,** to **achieve** further **liberalisation** gradually **through negotiation, and** to **set up an impartial means of settling disputes**" (WTO, undated).

# 1AR Turns Case

## AT Indigenous People NC

WTO regulations kill cultural diversity of indigenous people.

**FOE 3** writes[[18]](#footnote-18)

7. **The WTO is eroding cultural diversity: The WTO TRIPs Agreement allows companies to expropriate knowledge from local peoples in developing countries** who, in many cases, have been cultivators, researchers and protectors of plants for thousands of years. **The** TRIPs **Agreement permits** (primarily Northern) **t**ransnatio**n**al **c**ompanie**s to claim traditional** plant varieties or **plant uses as ‘inventions’ that must be respected the world over. Culture could** also **be further eroded if issues surrounding** the **entertainment** business - for example, films, broadcasting, music and publishing - **are included under the General Agreement on Trade in Services.**

## AT Democracy NC

WTO rules kills democracy.

**Global Exchange 11** writes[[19]](#footnote-19)

1. **The WTO Is Fundamentally Undemocratic** The policies of the WTO impact all aspects of society and the planet, but it is not a democratic, transparent institution. The **WTO rules are written by and for corporations with inside access** to the negotiations. For example, the US Trade Representative gets heavy input for negotiations from 17 “Industry Sector Advisory Committees.” **Citizen input by** consumer, **environmental**, human rights and labor **organizations is consistently ignored**. Even **simple requests for information are denied, and** the **proceedings are held in secret**. Who elected this secret global government?

Already spilled over to US democracy

**EIC 12** writes[[20]](#footnote-20)

**The WTO is a biased undemocratic organization** of 153 nations that limits America’s ability to act in its own best interest. In it, the United States has no larger vote than a smaller country, such as Grenada (Article IX, p. 5). By signing the agreement with the World Trade Organization, the U.S. **Congress agreed to concede a major portion of our sovereignty and usurp our democratic** legislative **process, including: Conforming U.S. laws**, regulations and administrative procedures **to the will of the WTO** (Article XVI, p. 10) **Subjecting all federal, state and local laws** and practices **that affect trade to international review by the WTO** (Article XVI, p. 10) **Allowing any WTO member country to challenge federal, state and local laws** and practices as trade impeding (Section 2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding) Taking all trade disputes to the WTO judiciary – giving the WTO final jurisdiction over all trade altercations. No appeal exists outside of the WTO (Section 2 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding) **Empowering the WTO to enforce its rulings by imposing fines on the U**nited **S**tates **until we comply** Disallowing Congress to change the agreement. The Rights of America are Subservient to the Will of the World Trade Organization. Those who Signed this Lengthy Agreement did not Read the Fine Print or did not have the Interests of America in Mind.

## AT Econ DA

WTO causes income inequality in developing countries, that’s Global Exchange 11.

Income inequality is the root cause of econ decline. **Harkinson 11** writes[[21]](#footnote-21)

Corporate chieftains often claim that fixing the US economy requires signing new free trade deals, lowering government debt, and attracting lots of foreign investment. But a major new study has found that those things matter less than an economic driver that CEOs hate talking about: equality. "Countries where income was more equally distributed tended to have longer growth spells," says economist Andrew Berg, whose study appears in the current issue of Finance & Development, the quarterly magazine of the International Monetary Fund. **Comparing** six major economic variables across **the world's economies, Berg found** that **equality of incomes was the most important factor in preventing** a **major downturn.** (See top chart.) Andrew Berg & Jonathan Ostry Andrew Berg & Jonathan OstryAndrew Berg & Jonathan Ostry In their study, Berg and coauthor Jonathan Ostry were less interested in looking at how to spark economic growth than how to sustain it. "Getting growth going is not that difficult; it's keeping it going that is hard," Berg explains. For example, the bailouts and stimulus pulled the US economy out of recession but haven't been enough to fuel a steady recovery. Berg's research suggests that sky-high income inequality in the United States could be partly to blame. So how important is equality? According to the study, **making** an economy's **income distribution 10 percent more equitable prolongs** its typical **growth** spell **by 50 percent.** In one case study, Berg looked at Latin America, which is historically much more economically stratified than emerging Asia and also has shorter periods of growth. He found that closing half of the inequality gap between Latin America and Asia would more than double the expected length of Latin America's growth spells. Increasing income inequality has the opposite effect: "We find that more inequality lowers growth," Berg says. (See bottom chart.) Berg and Ostry aren't the first economists to suggest that income inequality can torpedo the economy. Marriner Eccles, **the Depression-era chairman of the Federal Reserve** (and an architect of the New Deal), **blamed the Great Crash on the nation's wealth gap.** "A giant suction pump had by 1929-1930 drawn into a few hands an increasing portion of currently produced wealth," Eccles recalled in his memoirs. "In consequence, as in a poker game where the chips were concentrated in fewer and fewer hands, the other fellows could stay in the game only by borrowing. When the credit ran out, the game stopped." Many economists believe a similar process has unfolded over the past decade. **Median wages grew too little** over **the past 30 years** to drive the kind of spending necessary to sustain the consumer economy. Instead, increasingly **exotic forms of credit filled the gap, as the wealthy offered** the middle class **alluring credit card deals and** variable-interest **subprime loans. This allowed rich investors to keep making money** and everyone else to feel like they were keeping up—**until the whole system imploded.** Income inequality has other economic downsides. Research suggests that **unequal societies have a hard**er **time getting** their **citizens to support government spending because they believe that it will only benefit elites. A population where many lack access to health care, education, and** bank **loans can't contribute as much to the economy**. And, of course, income inequality goes hand-in-hand with crippling political instability, as we've seen during the Arab Spring in Tunisia, Egypt, and Libya. History shows that "sustainable reforms are only possible when the benefits are widely shared," Berg says. "We hope that we don't have to relearn that the hard way."

## AT Imperialism NC

Free trade ideology is Eurocentric. The rich from developed countries uniquely benefit.

**FOE 3** writes[[22]](#footnote-22)

**'Free trade'**, both on its own and as part of a wider free market economic paradigm, has become widely accepted the world over. Free market ideology **stems** very much **from a 'western' view** of the world **which sees individual** and/or private **power as the most legitimate** conception of **freedom**. A major part of this world-view is a belief that free market capitalism is the only viable socio-economic system and is thus 'right' for everyone. However free market ideology - a **belief in competitiveness, market forces and private ownership - is** very **much rooted in western culture and psychology and** is **not necessarily applicable across the world**. The impact of 'free trade' Trade liberalisation does not, as is often claimed, benefit all. **The main winners** from trade liberalisation so far **have been developed countries** (in particular the EU, the USA and Canada), transnational corporations, **the** already **rich and wealthy**, those with access to information and the owners of large farms. **The main losers include developing countries, the poor,** employees, subsistence and small farmers, **women, and those without access to information** (see The World Trade System: Winners and Losers, FOE for further details).

# 1AR AT Free Trade Good

**AT DCs Want Trade Rules**

Developing countries haven’t agreed to WTO rules because they actually benefit.

**Shahin 96** writes[[23]](#footnote-23)

The establishment of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) as the custodian and guarantor of a rule-based multilateral trading system was one of the cornerstones of the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations (MTNs) concluded at Geneva on 14 December 1993 and the signing of the Final Act as a 'single undertaking' at Marrakesh on 15 April 1994. The WTO is to be a dynamic framework for ensuring that trade rules and their effectiveness can keep pace with the evolution of the world economy and its Multilateral Trading System (MTS). There are no U-turns. One hundred and twenty countries have signed and are expected to abide by the WTO rules as well as its rulings. **The main reason** - in my view - **for developing countries signing the agreements** in Marrakesh **was** the **fear of being left behind, rather than truly being convinced of** any **benefit accruing to them** from the agreements. It is no exaggeration to say that **developing countries are still grappling with problems** of implementation **of the** various **agreements** annexed to the WTO **and** striving to understand **their full ramifications on their economies**. Whether developing countries are now better integrated in the global economy or into the so-called 'economic mainstream' will remain open until there is an effective implementation of the WTO agreements. No one can, however, deny that a number of developing countries participated actively in the Uruguay Round and contributed to the successful outcome of the negotiations, though only a few of them were considered as major players. Most developing countries made substantial commitments on market access, consolidating the results of their liberalisation programmes undertaken unilaterally. For several developing countries the average Most Favoured Nation (MFN) tariff reduction on industrial products was comparable to or greater than that of the countries in the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development (e.g. India, Republic of Korea, Venezuela and Brazil). For others the reduction was proportionately smaller, but from a level that was in general higher than in developed countries. A number of developing countries emerged from the Uruguay Round with their entire tariff schedule bound, either as a result of the tariff negotiations themselves (e.g. Argentina and Brazil), or the negotiation of their accession to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) during or immediately before the Round (e.g. Venezuela and Mexico respectively).

**AT Growth**

### Free Trade Theory

1. Free trade entails economic insecurity. Free trade theory is empirically denied.

**FOE 3** writes[[24]](#footnote-24)

One reason seems to be the faith that those supporters have in the theory underpinning free trade. Since the late 18th Century, various economists, businessmen and politicians have argued against intervention in international trade. Protectionism, they say, stifles international trade and is uneconomic, inefficient and leads eventually to job losses. Instead they argue for what they call 'free trade' or 'trade liberalisation'. **The theory of free trade was** further **developed by** David Ricardo's theory of **comparative advantage**. The theory of comparative advantage This theory states that nations should specialise in producing what they are best at, and that they should then trade with other nations (see Box 1). Free trade theory has more or less become gospel amongst many economists, and the WTO calls it "...arguably the single most powerful insight in economics" (WTO, undated). Box 1: The theory of comparative advantage If country A is better at producing food than country B, and country B better at producing clothes than A, both will be better off specialising in the production of those goods and trading with each other. This is known as 'absolute advantage'. If on the other hand country A is much more superior at food production and slightly more superior at clothes production than Country B, it might be expected that country B will 'lose'. However, comparative advantage theory says that, country A should invest in specialising in producing the good which it is comparatively more superior at making (food). Country B should still specialise in what it does best (clothes) and the countries should trade. It is beneficial for both countries because, the theory argues, it is more economically efficient. However, **the theory is based on the fact that capital is immobile and will be invested domestically. This is** patently **untrue in today's** globalised **world** of transnational corporations, international money markets and massive financial transactions, **where capital moves to wherever products can be produced at the least cost** - and does so at the touch of a button. For example, in 1999, total world cross-border investment flows amounted to over $800 billion. Short-term (often speculative) capital now totals more than $2 trillion annually. Thus, it is now the case that **some countries will have** or can acquire **absolute advantage and** that **others will lose out completely**. For example, the currency crisis that hit South East Asia in 1997 saw massive 'capital flight', resulting in, amongst other things, the Malaysian stock market losing 40% of its value (some M$250 billion) in just six months. **This can only lead to increasing economic insecurity** and the lowering of international standards as companies compete in the global market place. **Respected economists** and writers Herman Daly and John Cobb (Daly and Cobb, 1989) **have criticised** academic economists and **free market proponents for failing to re-examine comparative advantage theory** saying: "They have suppressed recognition of the fact that **the empirical cornerstone of the** whole **classical free trade argument**, capital immobility, **has crumbled** into loose gravel".

2. GDP increase is a flawed indicator of growth. **FOE 3** writes[[25]](#footnote-25)

The '**free**ing of **trade**' **has been accompanied by** global economic **growth** (albeit unevenly distributed) as **measured by** Gross Domestic Product (**GDP**)**.** However, **GDP is seriously deficient as a measure of** 'social welfare' or **'development'** because it reflects peoples' income rather than their real quality of life. **GDP counts the cost of health care, pollution** clean-up **and** the **renovation of habitats as positive contributions to** the nation's **wealth.** Thus **GDP can continue to rise, yet peoples' quality of life can deteriorate**. This helps to explain the apparent contradiction of rising GDP in many countries and the sharp increase in criticism being leveled at the WTO.

### Foreign Investment

1. East Asia proves. Foreign investment makes economies less stable, risking global decline and poverty. **FOE 3** writes[[26]](#footnote-26)

Box 3: All the World's a loser. **The** 19**97 Asian economic collapse - a global crisis** with global effects **caused by a global trade system** Cause: **Speculative capital poured into** the relatively immature **Asian** financial **markets to take advantage of** the **growth** in the tiger economies. **At the first signs of economic problems,** this **capital flowed out** again **almost overnight. This was** made **possible because of deregulated financial markets**. Effects: It is estimated that **over 50 million more people in Asia fell in**to **poverty. In East Asia alone, unemployment increased by 3**.3 **million**. The only major growth economy in the developed world - the US - had to absorb surplus and cheap production from Asia causing unemployment and a very large trade deficit in the US. Impacts were also felt elsewhere around the world, for example, cheaper exports from Thailand also caused the closure of a German Electronics company in the UK with the loss of 1,100 jobs. Following the Asian crisis, **global economic growth slowed down to about 2%, its lowest level for five years. Export commodity prices** also **declined, with severe impacts on African countries** dependent on primary raw materials. Source: UNDP, 1999

2. Foreign investment doesn’t make developing countries better off.

**FOE 3** writes[[27]](#footnote-27)

**As** Rubens **Ricupero, Secretary General of UNCTAD** recently **commented: "**So far **there is no empirical evidence to suggest that developing countries are** necessarily **better off in terms of attracting** and retaining quality **FDI within** the confines of **multilateral**ly agreed **disciplines** in investment ... What is evident … is that the existence of investment rules will do little to tackle the problem of distribution of the potential gains from trade and FDI. **Investment tends to concentrate where capital is already present.** Thus, imbalances between and within countries - imbalances that have been sharply exacerbated as a result of globalisation and liberalisation - will not be affected by the absence of investment barriers, as some of its proponents have suggested" (Ricupero, 1999). Box 4: Foreign direct investment (FDI) Some 80 per cent of FDI is accounted for by cross border mergers and acquisitions (UNCTAD, 2000). These are renowned for leading to job losses. Subsequent to one such merger (of BP and Amoco) 7,000 redundancies were announced. Moreover, in 1998 BP-Amoco axed a further 3,000 jobs because, despite the fact that it still made a massive $4.5 billion profit, this was a drop from $6.5 billion the previous year. In 1999, BP-Amoco acquired American oil company Arco resulting in a further 2,000 job losses. In 2000, Chevron acquired Texaco with the predicted loss of 4,000 jobs. **In** 19**99, China attracted** about **20% of** all **FDI inflows to developing countries** (the next highest were Brazil at some 15%, Argentina and Hong Kong China both11%, and Mexico and the Republic of Korea both 5% ). **China is not renowned for its deregulatory approach** to investment or any other sector of its economy. **FDI is** much **more likely** to be **attracted to countries with a large market, basic infrastructure and** a **good skills base**. This compounds the concept of ‘trade abandonment’ in which **the majority of FDI goes to a minority of countries whilst the others are abandoned** in a supposedly globalised economy. Source: UNCTAD, 2000.

### Exports

1. Cote d’Ivoire proves. Exports don’t ensure development.

**FOE 3** writes[[28]](#footnote-28)

Increasing **exports do not necessarily lead to development. Cote d'Ivoire has increased its exports** (from $3 billion in 1980 to $5 billion in 1995). However, **Cote d'Ivoire's GDP has remained stagnant** (the same $10 billion in 1995 as it was in 1980) **and their external debt has skyrocketed** (from $7 billion to $19 billion over the same period). Cote d'Ivoire is largely dependent on exports of primary commodities like coffee and cocoa yet, during the 1980s, the world market prices for these products collapsed. Cote d'Ivoire had to increase the volume of its exports to earn the same amount of revenue. **With an external debt nearly four times as much as** its **export revenue, Cote d'Ivoire is not going to be able to export its way out of the debt crisis and into development.**

2. Export-based development isn’t a universally viable economic model. **FOE 3** writes[[29]](#footnote-29)

Export-led development and debt as contributing factors: As a result of governments' wholesale acceptance of free trade theory as being in the public interest, the policies of the WTO, the IMF and the World Bank have focused on encouraging countries to follow a 'liberal free market' agenda. Export-led development - the (re)structuring of an economy towards producing goods for export markets in order to afford more imports and stimulate economic growth - is a further fundamental part of current western free market economic policy. However, the **empirical evidence in support of export-led development is poor**. A focus on export-led development generally pushes countries into cash crops or increased mineral production with associated, severe negative impacts on the environment and on local communities. (see The World Trade System: Winners and Losers, FOE for further detail and case studies). In addition, **not everyone can develop through** the **expansion of their export sector**. One of the "unspoken truisms of international trade" is that "...**it isn't possible for every nation to export more than it imports. Where will the surplus go?**" (Kierans and Stewart, 1989).

**AT TNC Enviro Standards**

His authors are wrong about globalization. **IJsslmuiden 2k** writes[[30]](#footnote-30)

Smith states that globalization of trade may benefit developing countries as multinational industries often have better safety standards than local ones. While this may be true, this ‘‘solution’’ applies to only a few people, and is very much a two-edged sword. **First**ly**, the fact** that **standards in multinational industries are better than** those of **local industries is less important than the fact** that those **standards are lower than those used** by the same industries **in industrialized countries**. While some workers may benefit, the overall message is that African lives are cheap. **Second**ly**, globalization is a narrow** economic **strategy for** maximizing **prosperity** for some **without taking into consideration** the **distribution of this prosperity or its current** and future **cost to the environment**. To me this argument is like the one that says: ‘‘Apartheid had its good points: at least we had less violence then’’.

## AT Level Playing Field

Small companies can’t compete against large corporate giants. The WTO perpetuates this.

**FOE 3** writes[[31]](#footnote-31)

One of the most oft-quoted phrases in the free trade lexicon is that it provides a 'level playing field' for international trade. This is highly erroneous. **Level playing fields are only relevant in competition between equals** - there is no point in Doncaster Rovers regularly competing on the same playing field as Manchester United, Barcelona or Vasco da Gama. Yet **small scale producers are expected to compete** in the global economy **along with** the likes of **Microsoft, Monsanto and Mitsubishi even though there are massive wealth differences. The WTO does nothing to correct these imbalances.**

1. Global Exchange (international human rights organization dedicated to promoting social, economic and environmental justice around the world). “Top Reasons to Oppose the WTO.” 2011. http://www.globalexchange.org/resources/wto/oppose [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Russell Mokhiber (editor of *Corporate Crime Reporter*) and Robert Weissman (editor of *Multinational Monitor*). “Top 10 Reasons to Shutter the WTO.” Mother Jones. November 24th, 1999. http://www.motherjones.com/politics/1999/11/top-10-reasons-shutter-wto [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Aurelie Walker (trade policy advisor at the Fairtrade Foundation. Aurelie has specialised in EU trade relations with Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific. She has worked as trade negotiator for an East African government, as advisor to business and government in Southern Africa on the Economic Partnership Agreement negotiations and for European Institutions and think tanks. Aurelie now advocates on behalf on Fairtrade producers on international trade issues). “The WTO has failed developing nations.” The Guardian. November 14th, 2011. http://www.theguardian.com/global-development/poverty-matters/2011/nov/14/wto-fails-developing-countries [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Global Exchange (international human rights organization dedicated to promoting social, economic and environmental justice around the world). “Top Reasons to Oppose the WTO.” 2011. http://www.globalexchange.org/resources/wto/oppose [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Joshua, Foreign Policy web editor, “The End of the World”, 11-13-09, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2009/11/13/the\_end\_of\_the\_world?page=full [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. E. Fuller and Robert H, Directors Stanley Medical Research Institute, 2005, Beasts of the Earth: Animals, Humans and Disease, pp. 5-6 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Fareed Zakaria (Editor of Newsweek International whose column appears in Newsweek, Newsweek International and The Washington Post). “A Threat Worse than Terror.” October 31st, 2005. Newsweek. http://www.fareedzakaria.com/ARTICLES/newsweek/103105.html [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Joshua Holland (Senior digital producer at BillMoyers.com, author of The 15 Biggest Lies About the Economy). “On Tap at the WTO: Private Water.” Alternet. December 15th, 2005. http://www.alternet.org/story/29639/on\_tap\_at\_the\_wto%3A\_private\_water [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Maude Barlow (National chairperson of The Council of Canadians. Co-founder of the Blue Planet Project. Chairs the board of Washington-based Food & Water Watch and is also an executive member of the San Francisco–based International Forum on Globalization and a Councillor with the Hamburg-based World Future Council. She is the recipient of eight honorary doctorates. Served as Senior Advisor on Water to the 63rd President of the United Nations General Assembly). “The Global Water Crisis and the Coming Battle for the Right to Water.” 25 February 2008, http://www.fpif.org/articles/the\_global\_water\_crisis\_and\_the\_coming\_battle\_for\_the\_right\_to\_water [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Maywa Montenegro, editor and writer at Seed magazine, “The Truth About Water Wars,” May 14, 2009 http://seedmagazine.com/content/article/the\_truth\_about\_water\_wars/ [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Sandra Postel [Global Water Policy, Amherst] and Aaron Wolf, Global Water [Assistant Professor of Geography, Ohio State University] <http://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/198/40343.html#postel> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Global Exchange (international human rights organization dedicated to promoting social, economic and environmental justice around the world). “Top Reasons to Oppose the WTO.” 2011. http://www.globalexchange.org/resources/wto/oppose [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. William W. Burke-White (Lecturer in Public and International Affairs and Senior Special Assistant to the Dean at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University and Ph.D. at Cambridge). “Human Rights and National Security: The Strategic Correlation.” The Harvard Human Rights Journal, Spring, 17 Harv. Hum. Rts. J. 249, Lexis. 2004. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Joel Trachtman (Professor of International Law). “Who Cares about International Human Rights? The Supply and Demand of International Human Rights Law.” 2012. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Carel IJsselmuiden (cool last name with two capital letters, Professor of Epidemiology, School of Health Systems and Public Health, University of Pretoria). “Better to die at 50 from cancer than 1 from malnutrition?” WHO Bulletin. 2000. http://www.who.int/bulletin/archives/78(9)1156.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Natasja Borjeson (Sodertorn University College, Department of Life Sciences). “WTO, GMO, and the Precautionary Principle – the conflict between trade liberalization and environmental protection.” 2007. http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:15723/FULLTEXT01.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Friends of the Earth International. “The world trade system: How it works and what’s wrong with it.” August 2003. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Friends of the Earth International. “The world trade system: How it works and what’s wrong with it.” August 2003. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Global Exchange (international human rights organization dedicated to promoting social, economic and environmental justice around the world). “Top Reasons to Oppose the WTO.” 2011. http://www.globalexchange.org/resources/wto/oppose [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Economy in Crisis (blog which provides daily reports of America’s economy). “Help Get the U.S. Out of the World Trade Organization (WTO) by Signing the Petition.” November 24th, 2012. http://economyincrisis.org/content/help-get-the-u-s-out-of-the-world-trade-organization-wto-by-signing-the-petition [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Josh Harkinson (staff reporter). “Study: Income Inequality Kills Economic Growth.” Mother Jones. October 4th, 2011. http://www.motherjones.com/mojo/2011/10/study-income-inequality-kills-economic-growth [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. Friends of the Earth International. “The world trade system: How it works and what’s wrong with it.” August 2003. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Magda Shahin (professor and director of the Prince Alwaleed Center for American Studies and Research, School of Global Affairs and Public Policy (GAPP) at The American University in Cairo). “From Marrakesh to Singapore: The WTO and Developing Countries.” Third World Network. 1996. http://www.twnside.org.sg/title/magda-cn.htm [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. Friends of the Earth International. “The world trade system: How it works and what’s wrong with it.” August 2003. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Friends of the Earth International. “The world trade system: How it works and what’s wrong with it.” August 2003. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. Friends of the Earth International. “The world trade system: How it works and what’s wrong with it.” August 2003. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. Friends of the Earth International. “The world trade system: How it works and what’s wrong with it.” August 2003. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. Friends of the Earth International. “The world trade system: How it works and what’s wrong with it.” August 2003. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Friends of the Earth International. “The world trade system: How it works and what’s wrong with it.” August 2003. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. Carel IJsselmuiden (cool last name with two capital letters, Professor of Epidemiology, School of Health Systems and Public Health, University of Pretoria). “Better to die at 50 from cancer than 1 from malnutrition?” WHO Bulletin. 2000. http://www.who.int/bulletin/archives/78(9)1156.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. Friends of the Earth International. “The world trade system: How it works and what’s wrong with it.” August 2003. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)